

APR 12 2005

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE 11.Apr.05	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED MAJOR REPORT	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE FREE-TO-ROLL INVESTIGATION OF THE PRE-PRODUCTION F/A-18E/F POWERED APPROACH WING DROP.			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) CAPT BRYANT ELAINE M				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  CI04-1033	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AFIT/CIA, BLDG 125 2950 P STREET WPAFB OH 45433			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unlimited distribution In Accordance With AFI 35-205/AFIT Sup 1			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)				
<b>DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A</b> Approved for Public Release Distribution Unlimited				
14. SUBJECT TERMS			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 8	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	

# Free-to-Roll Investigation of the Pre-production F/A-18E Powered Approach Wing Drop

D. Bruce Owens\*

*NASA Langley Research Center, Flight Dynamics Branch, Hampton, Virginia, 23681, USA*

Elaine M. Bryant†

*United States Air Force /University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742, USA*

and

Jewel B. Barlow‡

*University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742, USA*

A free-to-roll study of the low-speed lateral characteristics of the pre-production F/A-18E was conducted in the NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel. In developmental flight tests the F/A-18E unexpectedly experienced uncommanded lateral motions in the power approach configuration. The objective of this study was to determine the feasibility of using the free-to-roll technique for the detection of uncommanded lateral motions for the pre-production F/A-18E in the power approach configuration. The data revealed that this technique in conjunction with static data revealed insight into the cause of the lateral motions. The free-to-roll technique identified uncommanded lateral motions at the same angle-of-attack range as experienced in flight tests. The cause of the uncommanded lateral motions was unsteady asymmetric wing stall. The paper also shows that free-to-roll data or static force and moment data alone are not enough to accurately capture the potential for an aircraft to experience uncommanded lateral motion.

## Nomenclature

AOA	=	angle of attack
$C_L$	=	lift coefficient
$C_l$	=	total rolling moment coefficient
$C_{l\alpha}$	=	rolling moment forcing function coefficient
$C_{lp}$	=	dynamic lateral stability coefficient, roll damping
$C_{l\beta}$	=	static lateral stability coefficient, spring effect
FTR	=	free-to-roll
HT	=	horizontal tail
LEF	=	leading edge flap
LEX	=	leading edge extension
PID	=	Parameter Identification
psf	=	pounds per square feet
TEF	=	trailing edge flap
VT	=	vertical tail

\* Aerospace Engineer, Associate Fellow AIAA.

† Graduate Student, Aerospace Engineering, College Park MD, Member AIAA.

‡ Director Glenn L. Martin Wind Tunnel, Aerospace Engineering, Associate Fellow AIAA.

*This paper is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States.*

*"The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government." SPR-179.04*

20050418 006

$\alpha$  = angle of attack  
 $\beta$  = angle of sideslip  
 $\phi$  = body axis roll angle

## I. Introduction

IN 1996 the U.S. Navy's F/A-18E/F Super Hornet experienced uncommanded lateral motions, or wing drop, in the power approach (PA) configuration during developmental flight tests. These motions were not expected based on computational or experimental predictions during the design studies. Wing drop posed a potential risk to flight safety due to its occurrence at low altitudes and airspeeds. Based on data from investigative flight tests, wing drop was eliminated by retracting deployable vents located on the LEX. The vents were located at the junction of the LEX and the wing. Figure 1 shows the location of the LEX and the LEX vent in the open position. Aligning the LEX vent flush with the LEX generates a LEX vents-closed configuration. Although the LEX vents are not employed on the production version of the Super Hornet several efforts have been made to understand how opening the vents changed the flow topology that resulted in the uncommanded motions.




Figure 1. F/A-18E Super Hornet in approach configuration with the LEX vents open<sup>5</sup>

Although closing the LEX vents eliminated the wing drop problem questions remained as to the occurrence and cause of the phenomenon and how the vents open configuration played a roll. Cook and Barlow<sup>2-4</sup> and Cook<sup>1</sup> reported studies of the flow topologies on pre-production F/A-18E models that have shed much light on the characteristics of the flows. Cook<sup>3</sup> conducted an in depth study into the behavior of the flow over the pre-production F/A-18E. He determined that the phenomenon was characteristic of a subcritical flow bifurcation, "the abrupt replacement of an unstable flow topology with a stable one."<sup>2</sup> A bifurcation is the change in quality of the flow due to the change in some physical parameter. In the case of pre-production F/A-18E the parameter was angle of attack. Cook<sup>2</sup> concluded from flow visualization tests that opening the vents lifted the vortices coming off the strakes away from the wing surface and pushed them toward the fuselage. The result was a separated region at mid-wing that grew with increasing angle of attack.

Table 1. The value of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  when PA wing drop occurred for the given flight maneuver.

Aircraft, Flight, Maneuver	$\alpha$ Deg.	$\beta$ Deg.
E1, 12, 19	15.0	0.0
E2, 17, 67	12.1	-0.4
E1, 26, 18	15.8	0.2
E1, 26, 20	15.0	0.7
E2, 39, 13	14.5	0.5
E2, 39, 21	13.6	-2.5
E2, 39, 23	13.8	1.2
E2, 39, 24	13.7	0.0
E2, 40, 41	13.3	-1.2
F1, 06, 12	14.2	unavailable

Once the critical state (i.e., rapid change in the slope of an aerodynamic parameter) was reached the separated region affects the outboard portion of the wing causing a loss of lift. Due to the unpredictable nature of the bifurcation this can occur asymmetrically hence the wing drop.

Some aspects of the time dependence of forces and flows have been observed and reported but the models have always been held stationary. In actual flight events, the airplane exhibited transient motions in response to force and moment variations due to wing flow unsteadiness. This experience provides a strong motivation for the application of the free-to-roll (FTR) method. The classical FTR test technique offered promise for shedding additional light on the flight dynamics and aerodynamics of the lateral motions of the vents-open and vents-closed pre-production F/A-18E configurations. Owens et al<sup>5,6</sup> reported on an extensive study of transonic uncommanded lateral motions of military aircraft using the free-to-roll technique, including the pre-production F/A-18E. The motivations, methods, and objectives for the application of the FTR method to the PA configuration parallel those for the transonic FTR tests of the pre-production F/A-18E. The physics of the aerodynamic phenomena associated with the uncommanded motions in the two cases are different.

The objective of this effort was to conduct a FTR feasibility test on the pre-production F/A-18E to determine if this technique can be used to detect the uncommanded lateral motions as seen in flight. The method-of-evaluation was to compare indications for uncommanded lateral motions from the FTR method to the results from the in-flight tests (Table 1) and the static data<sup>1-4</sup>. Good correlation between the developmental flight-testing and the FTR testing,

supported by static testing, would help establish capability for early identification of potential uncommanded lateral motions. In support of this method-of-evaluation a candidate FTR figure-of-merit (FOM) was proposed and assessments were carried out in three areas: severity and types of model motions, unsteady and nonlinear aerodynamics, and roll damping.

## II. Experimental Approach

The model used for both the static and the FTR testing was a 10% scale model of the pre-production F/A-18E. The model, constructed of balsa wood, plywood, fiberglass and aluminum, was outfitted with wing tip missiles, canopy, engine inlets, leading edge flaps (LEF), ailerons, flap shrouds, trailing edge flaps (TEF), vertical tail (VT), horizontal tail (HT) and LEX vents. The control surfaces were movable and could be set at specific values. For the data presented herein the HTs and rudders were set to  $0^\circ$ . The LEX vents could be set to various open positions or they could be closed completely. The static and FTR testing were both done in the NASA Langley 12-Foot Low-Speed Tunnel. The experiments were conducted at sea-level pressure and density with a freestream dynamic pressure of 4 psf resulting in a mean aerodynamic chord-based Reynolds number of  $0.5 \times 10^6$ . Although numerous configurations were tested, the paper will present LEX vents closed and LEX vents open with the LEF =  $10^\circ$ , TEF =  $30^\circ$ , and ailerons =  $30^\circ$  (symmetric trailing-edge-down deflection). This positioning of the ailerons and TEF is referred to as the PA-half configuration.

### A. Static Testing

The static force and moments were measured using an internally mounted six-component strain gauge balance (NASA FF12). A series of both  $\alpha$ - and  $\beta$ -sweeps were conducted with the configurations. Initially  $\alpha$ -sweeps over the range  $-4^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 20^\circ$  were conducted but for the majority of the runs a smaller  $\alpha$ -range ( $10^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 20^\circ$ ) with a higher resolution was chosen to cover the area of interest. Also,  $\beta$ -sweeps with a range of  $-16^\circ \leq \beta \leq 16^\circ$  were performed in the smaller  $\alpha$ -range to assess the static lateral characteristics. The data were sampled at a rate of 80 Hz for 10 seconds using a low-pass analog filter with cutoff frequency of 4 Hz. All data taken during the 10 second sample time was recorded. The paper will present both the time-averaged balance data as well as the time history of the balance signals over this 10 second window.

### B. Free to Roll Testing

In the FTR test technique the model is constrained to roll about the longitudinal body axis. Switching from the static-force-and-moment phase to the FTR requires replacing the balance with the FTR rig. Modifications to the interior of the model were required in order to accommodate the FTR rig. The FTR rig houses a resolver to measure the roll angle time history with an accuracy of 0.12 degrees. The roll angle signal was recorded at a rate of 200 Hz using a low-pass analog filter with a cutoff frequency of 4 Hz. Video of the lateral activity was also recorded. The FTR rig contains an air brake to stop the motion and allow the data point to start with a zero initial roll rate. The model's mass was balanced such that the lateral and vertical center-of-gravity coordinates were located on the roll axis. The model's roll inertia was determined experimentally and found to be  $0.40 \text{ slug-ft}^2$ . This inertia value is close to that required for dynamic scaling. With knowledge of the roll inertia, the total rolling moment,  $C_l$ , can be calculated by twice differentiating the roll angle time histories. The rolling-moment time histories are then used in PID methods to determine  $C_{lp}$ . The PID method used is described in Ref. 5.

There were three ways to conduct a FTR test point: continuous pitch sweeps, pitch-pause, and bank & release. For the continuous pitch-sweeps, the model was allowed to roll freely while going through a range of pitch angles. This type of test point quickly reveals any lateral activity over the  $\alpha$ -range. The procedure for a pitch-pause point involved setting the model to the desired  $\alpha$  and holding it there with the brake. Upon brake release the lateral motion was recorded. The information gathered reveals what the model will do when the roll angle and the roll rate are set to zero. The procedure for the bank & release points was to set the model at an initial roll angle other than zero and then release the brake. The bank & release points are used to assess how the model will react to a given initial rolling moment, assess roll-damping for the cases where no lateral activity existed at a pitch-pause point, and investigate how inducing a rolling motion affects any motions observed previously.

In order to quantify the lateral activity a FOM was used similar to the one developed by Owens et al<sup>5,6</sup>. The FOM is calculated from the roll-angle time histories and captures amplitude and rate effects. It is defined by:


$$P_{P-V} \equiv \left( \left| \frac{\Delta \phi}{\Delta t} \right| \frac{b}{2V_\infty} \right)_{\max}$$
. The plots of the FTR-FOM versus  $\alpha$  were used to quantify the relative severity of the lateral activity for various configurations and test conditions. This FOM is not intended to indicate the type of motion, how

long it took for the motion to develop or how often the events happened. However it has proven to be an accurate indicator of where uncommanded lateral motion will occur in flight<sup>5</sup> and serves as conservative first filter for assessing the severity of the motion.

The rolling motion can be described by a combination of a forcing function ( $C_{l\alpha}$ ), roll damping ( $C_{l_p}$ ), and static lateral stability ( $C_{l_\beta}$ ) effects. Therefore, it is instructive when analyzing the data from a FTR test to consider the equation of motion in terms of the Euler angle  $\phi$  as:  $\frac{I_x \ddot{\phi}}{qSb} + C_{l_\beta} \frac{\dot{\phi}}{2V_\infty} + C_{l_p} \phi = C_{l\alpha}$ . The foregoing unsteady nonlinear equation is analogous to a mass-spring-damper system where:  $C_{l\alpha}$  represents an aerodynamic forcing function;  $C_{l_\beta}$  represents the spring constant which, along with the inertia, determines the frequency of oscillation; and  $C_{l_p}$  represents the damping coefficient. In the FTR technique, the use of  $C_{l_\beta}$  and  $C_{l_p}$  is kinematically equivalent. By measuring roll angle versus time, the FTR technique captures the composite effect of both static and dynamic forces acting on the model regardless of whether they are steady or unsteady. The FTR roll angle time histories must be interpreted as open-loop motions due to aerodynamics and cannot be directly used to predict aircraft motions.

### III. Results and Analysis

This section will discuss the results for the vents-open and vents-closed configurations. The analysis will begin by using the FTR-FOM to show the relative severity and  $\alpha$ -ranges of lateral activity for the configurations. Then detailed analysis will be presented for representative points within the  $\alpha$ -range of lateral activity. The lateral activity of the two configurations is compared in Fig. 2 using the FTR-FOM. The plot shows that for  $12^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 15^\circ$  opening



**Figure 2.** FTR-FOM comparison between vents closed and vents open. Values of the FOM are calculated using pitch-pause points.


the vents causes a significant increase in lateral activity with the maximum activity being at  $\alpha = 13^\circ$ . This  $\alpha$ -range directly correlates to the  $\alpha$ -range in flight tests where wing drop occurred<sup>5</sup> (Table 1). Significant lateral activity was defined for this test to occur when the motion would produce a value of  $p_{p-v} \geq 0.010$ . The correlation to flight data using the FTR-FOM is only the  $\alpha$ -range. For  $\alpha = 15.5^\circ$ ,  $16^\circ$ , and  $16.5^\circ$ , closing the vents increases lateral activity relative to the vents open position. For  $\alpha = 16.25^\circ$  and  $17^\circ$ , the severity of lateral activity is the same for both positions of the vents. For  $\alpha = 16.75^\circ$

and  $\alpha \geq 17.5^\circ$  opening the vents caused an increase in lateral activity. In summary, the FTR-FOM plot divides the  $\alpha$ -range into three regions:  $12^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 15^\circ$ ,  $15.5^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 17^\circ$ , and  $\alpha > 17^\circ$ . For regions 1 and 3 there is a distinct reduction in lateral activity by closing the vents. In region 2 there are mixed results.


The following discussion will use the FTR-FOM plot as the starting point for more detailed analysis. The points that will be analyzed will be one from region 1 and one from region 2 since this covers the  $\alpha$ -range where wing drop was seen in flight. From region 1,  $\alpha = 13^\circ$  is chosen for analysis since this point shows the largest difference between vents open and closed, and wing drop was first identified in flight at  $\alpha = 13^\circ$ . In order to show the amplitude and frequency change of the lateral activity between the two configurations, the roll angle time histories are shown for vents open and closed in Fig 3. The plot reiterates the large reduction in lateral activity by closing the



vents. The cause of the rolling motion can be generated by any or all combinations of a forcing function,  $C_{l\alpha}$ , spring effects,  $C_{l\beta}$ , and roll damping,  $C_{l\dot{\beta}}$ . Also, the aerodynamic terms may be unsteady. The following discussion will address each of these possibilities.




**Figure 3.** Roll angle time histories for the vents-open and -closed configurations at  $\alpha = 13^\circ$ .



**Figure 4.** Effect of vents on the time-averaged static rolling moment.

The time-averaged values of  $C_{l\alpha}$  are shown in Fig. 4 with a plot of rolling moment coefficient from the static force & moment test. (Note. There is an average  $C_l = 0.002$  offset for both configurations below  $\alpha = 17^\circ$ . The cause of this asymmetry in the data is probably due to tunnel sidewash and/or model asymmetries. The data will be discussed relative to the offset.) The time-averaged value of  $C_{l\alpha}$  at  $\alpha = 13^\circ$  for the vents-open configuration is not large enough to cause the significant lateral activity that was seen on the FTR rig. Balance rolling moment time histories indicate that  $C_{l\alpha}$  is unsteady for the vents-open position. The time history signals for the  $\alpha = 12^\circ$  data in Fig. 4 is shown in Fig. 5 for the vents-open and -closed position. The time-average of these signals is shown in Fig. 4 at  $\alpha = 12^\circ$ . No balance data was taken for the vents-closed case at  $\alpha = 13^\circ$  so a comparison is made at  $\alpha = 12^\circ$ . The characteristics of the balance signals at  $\alpha = 12^\circ$  is indicative of the balance signals where data was taken in the  $12^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 15^\circ$  for the two configurations. The plot shows that the vents-open configuration has aperiodic rolling



**Figure 5.** Balance rolling moment time history for vents open and vents closed,  $\alpha = 12^\circ$ .

moment spikes with sufficient amplitude and low enough frequency that would probably cause rigid body rolling motion. Figure 6 shows the static lateral stability characteristics,  $C_{l\beta}$ , for the vents-open configuration. The plot shows that the model has a strong spring,  $C_{l\beta}$ . The roll damping characteristics are shown in Fig. 7. The plot shows that the model was damped and no significant difference or change in roll damping characteristics over the  $\alpha$ -range where activity was seen in flight. Therefore, based on the spring-mass-damper analogy, the lateral activity produced by opening the vents

in the  $12 \leq \alpha \leq 15^\circ$  range was caused by an unsteady forcing function. The response to this forcing function was wing drops because the model is well damped with a strong restoring force (spring). The lift characteristics of the two configurations are shown in Fig. 8. The data show that the vents-open configuration produces a more non-linear lift curve than the vents-closed configuration. Nonetheless, there are no sharp breaks with significant loss in lift. These data show that even though no time-averaged rolling moment spike occurs (Fig. 4) and no significant changes in the time-averaged lift curve slope are evident (Fig. 8), the wing can still




Figure 6. Static lateral stability characteristics for vents-open configuration,  $\alpha = 13^\circ$ .

From region 2, the lateral activity at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$  will be analyzed since this occurs at a critical state (i.e. rapid change in the slope of an aerodynamic parameter) as indicated in the static rolling moment curve of Fig. 4 and is the point in region 2 where the lateral activity between the two configurations is a maximum as indicated by the FTR-FOM plot of Fig. 2. The roll angle time histories of the vents-closed and -open positions are shown in Fig. 9. Prior to the FTR testing it was expected that the vents-open position would exhibit significant wing drop at  $\alpha$ 's around  $16^\circ$  because the wing is going through stall and there is a significant spike in the rolling moment curve (Fig. 4). The wing stall (Fig. 8) and rolling moment characteristics (Fig. 4) are benign for the vents-closed configuration. Therefore, it was expected that the vents-closed configuration would not exhibit significant lateral activity. Figure 9




Figure 8. Lift characteristics for the vents-open and vents-closed configurations.




Figure 7. Effect of vents on roll damping.

experience an unsteady aerodynamic forcing function that causes uncommanded lateral motions. It is then left to the FTR technique to show that this unsteady aerodynamic forcing function produces undesirable lateral activity.

shows with a plot of the roll-angle time histories that just the opposite happened. Compared to vents-open activity at  $\alpha = 13^\circ$ , the vents-closed activity at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$  is of smaller amplitude and higher frequency. This is reflected in the FTR-FOM plot, Fig. 2.

The time-averaged value of  $C_{l_0}$  shown in Fig. 4 shows that at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$  there is a significant value of  $C_{l_0}$  (0.006) for the vents-open case. The time-history plot for the




Figure 9. Roll angle time histories of the vents-open and vents-closed configurations at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$ .




Figure 10. Static lateral stability for vents open and closed at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$ .




Figure 11.  $\beta$  time histories of the vents-opens and vents-closed configurations at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$ .

to significantly roll the model. The stable  $C_{l\beta}$  characteristic of the vents-open configuration provides a strong restoring force which decreases the impact of the relatively small unsteady rolling moments (Fig. 12) on motions of the model (Fig. 9), while still exciting small motions about the trim roll angle. The data show that neither the static lateral stability, or the presence of unsteady aerodynamic rolling moments by themselves predict the motion of the model. The FTR testing shows the impact of the combinative effects of static stability, damping, and unsteady aerodynamic forces.

#### IV. Conclusion

The FTR technique was used to assess the potential for a pre-production F/A-18E model to predict wing drop as was experienced in flight. Using a FTR-FOM, the technique accurately captured the  $\alpha$ -range where wing drop was experienced in flight. Also, the technique showed that, in agreement with flight data, lateral activity was significantly reduced if not eliminated by closing the LEX vents. In the  $\alpha = 12^\circ$  to  $15^\circ$  range, the analysis of the FTR and

vents-open configuration (Fig. 9) shows a left wing down bias which contradicts the rolling moment data of Fig 4. Previous data<sup>3</sup> shows that this same 10% F/A-18E model can exhibit negative rolling moment spikes. Evidently, when the model was changed from the static force & moment mount to the FTR the model had a tendency to stall such that a left wing down rolling moment was generated as in the previous test of Ref 3.

The static lateral stability at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$  is shown in Fig. 10 with a plot of  $C_l$  vs  $\beta$ . The plot shows that the vents-open configuration is stable in the  $-4^\circ \leq \beta \leq +4^\circ$  range with a  $C_{l0}$  of 0.008. This value equals the  $C_{l0}$  in Fig. 4. The trim point is around  $\beta = 1.75^\circ$ . This is close to the average value of  $\beta$  that corresponds to the average roll angle in Fig. 9 assuming the possibility that the vents-open curve of Fig. 9 can be reflected about the origin. Figure 10 shows that the vents-closed configuration is neutrally stable with a zero rolling moment value for  $-4^\circ \leq \beta \leq +4^\circ$ . Therefore any disturbance in the flow will cause the model to roll within this  $\beta$ -range. Figure 11 shows that the  $\beta$ -range for the vents-closed roll angle time history in Fig. 9 is also approximately within  $-4^\circ \leq \beta \leq +4^\circ$ . The roll damping at  $\alpha = 16$  in Fig. 7 shows that the model is well damped for both configurations.

Now investigating the possibility of an unsteady forcing function, Fig. 12 compares the balance rolling-moment time history of the vents open to vents closed at  $\alpha = 16^\circ$ . Figure 12 shows that both vents-open and vents-closed configurations exhibit unsteady rolling moment variations – though at reduced levels than seen in the previous data for  $\alpha = 12^\circ$ . For the case of the vents-closed configuration, the neutral static lateral stability at small  $\beta$ 's allows the unsteady rolling moment




Figure 12. Balance rolling moment time history for vents open and vents closed,  $\alpha = 16^\circ$ .



static force & moment data showed that the lateral activity with the vents open was caused by an unsteady aerodynamic forcing function. The response to this forcing function was wing drops because the model is well damped with a strong restoring force (spring). The lift characteristics and time-averaged static rolling moment values showed no indication for wing drop in this  $\alpha$ -range. This result shows the importance in using the FTR technique along with unsteady force and moment measurements to predict areas of uncommanded lateral motions. In the  $15^\circ < \alpha < 17^\circ$  range, the lateral activity of the vents-closed case was primarily caused by neutral static stability with contribution from an unsteady forcing function. In this  $\alpha$ -range for the vents-open case, the lift characteristics and time-averaged static rolling moment values would indicate a potential for wing drop. The FTR technique showed that the model would just roll over to trim out the rolling moment spike and then wing rock with a low amplitude and rate about this trim point probably because of an unsteady forcing function. Roll damping was found to be stable for all configurations. The FTR technique can be used to predict areas of uncommanded lateral motions for the pre-production F/A-18E in the PA configuration.

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Steve Cook and Steve Donaldson of NAVAIR, Patuxent River, Maryland for financial sponsorship and research guidance.

### References

<sup>1</sup>Cook, S., "On Flow Topology Changes Accompanying Aerodynamic Bifurcation for Aircraft with Vented Strakes", Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Maryland, 2003.

<sup>2</sup>Cook, S., and Barlow, J., "An Investigation of Low-Speed Lateral Characteristics of a Simplified F/A-18E Configuration", AIAA-2003-0931, January 2003.

<sup>3</sup>Cook, S. and Barlow, J., "Investigation of Effects of Leading Edge Extension Vents the Lateral Characteristics of the F/A-18-E in Power Approach Configuration", AIAA 2000-4510, August, 2000.

<sup>4</sup>Cook, S., and Barlow, J., "Investigation of Critical States of the F/A-18E in Power Approach Configuration Using Mini-Tuft Flow Visualization", AIAA 2001-4145, August, 2001.

<sup>5</sup>Owens, B., Capone, F., Hall, R., Brandon, J., and Chambers, J., "Transonic Free-To-Roll Analysis of Abrupt Wing Stall on Military Aircraft," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 2004, pp. 474-484.

<sup>6</sup>Owens, B., McConnell, J., Brandon, J., and Hall, B., "Transonic Free-To-Roll Analysis of the F/A-18E and F-35 Configurations," AIAA 2004-5053, August 2004.